



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Advocate of Peace.

VOL. LXXV.

WASHINGTON, D. C., JULY, 1913.

No. 7

## THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY, PUBLISHERS,

COLORADO BUILDING, WASHINGTON, D. C.  
CABLE ADDRESS—"AMPAX, WASHINGTON."

MONTHLY, ONE DOLLAR PER YEAR. TEN CENTS PER COPY  
Entered as Second-Class Matter June 1, 1911, at the Post Office at  
Washington, D. C., under the Act of July 16, 1894.

Make all checks payable to the American Peace Society. To personal checks on Western and Southern banks add ten cts. for collecting

### CONTENTS.

	PAGE
EDITORIALS .....	145-147
Reasons for Renewing the Treaties—Mr. Bryan, Pacifist and Diplomat—Peace in the Balkans—Japanese Studying Situation at First Hand—Our Ambassador to Great Britain.	
EDITORIAL NOTES .....	149-150
Holland this Summer—False and Dangerous—German International Conciliation—Business Men for Peace—Visit from Noted Brazilian.	
AMONG THE PEACE ORGANIZATIONS .....	150
BRIEF PEACE NOTES .....	151
GENERAL ARTICLES:	
The Proper Attitude of the Hague Conference Toward the Laws of War. <i>Jackson H. Ralston</i> .....	152
Should the Panama Tolls Question Be Arbitrated? <i>Thomas Raeburn White</i> .....	154
The Identity of the Interests of the United States and Canada. <i>John Lewis</i> .....	156
Our Gift to the Hague Peace Palace. <i>Lucia Ames Mead</i> ..	160
The William Ladd Commemoration at Portsmouth, N. H. <i>Charles E. Beals</i> .....	160
Work of the New York Peace Society. <i>Wm. H. Short</i> .....	161
A Peace Pageant on Hague Day. <i>Charles E. Beals</i> .....	162
Resolution by the Massachusetts Peace Society .....	163
BOOK NOTICES .....	163
BRANCHES OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY .....	165
PUBLICATIONS OF THE AMERICAN PEACE SOCIETY .....	167
BOOKS FOR SALE .....	168

## Reasons for Renewing the Treaties.

A most important question is now pending before the United States Senate which must interest every advocate of peace and arbitration, that of the renewal of numerous arbitration treaties heretofore entered into by the United States. In the year 1908 and the following years some twenty treaties were made with various nations, strong and weak, under which it was agreed that differences which might arise of a legal nature or relating to the interpretation of existing treaties which it might not have been possible to settle by diplomacy, should be referred to the permanent court of arbitration established at The Hague, providing, however, that these differences did not affect the vital interests, the independence or the honor of the two contracting States, and did not concern the interests of third parties. Each treaty was concluded for a period of five years.

These treaties are modeled upon an agreement between France and Great Britain in the year 1904, an agreement which was followed by numerous other conventions between nations of Europe. While these conventions contain the exemptions named they have paved the way for the amicable settlement of the great majority of controversies likely to arise between nations. They are also part of an orderly progress in the direction of peace. Indeed they marked a distinct step toward other treaties, such as those with Great Britain and France submitted to the Senate by President Taft and Secretary Knox in the year 1911.

The five-year period has terminated in some cases and is now coming to a close in others. The treaty with France was renewed without opposition in the month of February last. Those with Great Britain, Spain, and Italy have expired, and the administration has promptly submitted propositions for their renewal. Each of the countries mentioned has signified its desire to renew, but unfortunately opposition has developed in the Senate which seems quite formidable. This opposition arose in the first instance in relation to the treaty with Great Britain, and for no reason except that it might involve a submission of the question of our right to remit tolls on American ships engaged in domestic trade passing through the Panama Canal, a question resting on existing treaty relations. By no stretch of construction could this controversy be regarded as one affecting the vital interests, independence, or the honor of the two contracting States.

This opposition is to be regretted. If ratification of the treaties in the form presented should be refused, it would indicate a backward step of the most serious nature. It would show to the world that our claim that we believe in arbitration is a mere empty boast; that we are willing to arbitrate when there is no possibility of an adverse decision, but whenever our position is a doubtful one we refuse. In the past we have been in the very forefront not only as regards arbitrations to which the United States has been a party, but in seeking by friendly offices to secure peace between other nations. This was notably true of the efforts of President Roosevelt to terminate the bloody war between Japan and Russia. We cannot afford to destroy this most beneficent record because of unwillingness to submit to a fair tribunal the question of Panama Canal tolls. In an exceptional sense this is one which should not be the source of a quarrel between friendly countries. The exemption or non-exemption does not mean any abatement of national honor. To free our ships in the domestic trade from charges for passing through the canal

would, as has been repeatedly pointed out, confer no very great benefit on shippers. The principal advantage would accrue to shipping interests which already have a well-established monopoly. To deviate from our traditional record of a desire for fair treatment to other nations and the peaceful settlement of disputes would be to exchange a noble record for a mess of pottage.

In a few months the arbitration treaty with Japan will terminate. Japan has already signified her desire to renew it, but violent opposition comes from the Pacific coast because the decision of an arbitral court might give a status to Japanese citizens in the United States which the legislation of several commonwealths seeks to deny them. This question is also one which should not prevent the renewal of a treaty with Japan accompanied by a contemporaneous agreement made in the year 1909. In this enlightened day no nation can ignore its obligations to the other nations of the earth. There should be a sacredness in regard to international agreements which does not attach itself even to engagements between individuals. It is beyond belief that the traditional friendship between the United States and Japan should be destroyed or shattered by a controversy of this nature. Fortunately there is every probability that all grounds of irritation can be settled by diplomacy without resort to arbitration.

A favorite argument against arbitration repeatedly reiterated in recent years has been that as the United States is detached from Europe, not merely because of her isolation geographically, but because of institutions different from a majority of nations in the Old World, we cannot trust the judgment of an official tribunal made up of foreigners. In other words, our contentions would be considered by a biased court. Here again we cannot afford to act upon the presumption that we must hold aloof from the great family of nations because of a possible prejudice against us. A more conclusive refutation of this objection, however, is our experience in arbitrations in past years, concerning which there is a prevalent misapprehension. Superficial students of the subject have maintained that we have suffered injuries by the decrees of courts of arbitration. Exactly the contrary is the case. There is no country which has a more satisfactory record of favorable awards. Almost every kind of controversy, such as indignities or injustices to citizens, questions of boundary, fishing rights and many others have been submitted to arbitration. There have been 77 of these awards, in which the decisions against the United States have numbered 12; there have been 15 cases in which, on consideration of counter-claims, there have been partial awards in favor of both countries, but in 50 instances the decisions or awards have been entirely in favor of the United States. The grand total of awards has reached \$93,000,000, of which \$69,000,000, or approximately three-fourths, has been in favor of our country.

In the list of countries in Europe, which have been parties to arbitrations in which the interest of the United States was concerned, are included Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Spain, Portugal,

and Denmark, together with a number of other countries. There have been arbitrations with Mexico and almost every country in the New World. In the award of the so-called Boxer Indemnity against China in 1901, the decision was such that the United States remitted a very large share of the amount. Nothing in our history gives ground for refusing to renew our treaties.

Both President Wilson and Secretary Bryan have expressed their earnest desire that these treaties may be ratified without modification and it should be the earnest desire of every advocate of arbitration that the Senate may act promptly that our country may retain the position which it has assumed—that of leadership in the great cause of international peace. Not to renew our treaties would be a backward step indeed.

### Mr. Bryan, Pacifist and Diplomat.

There is no mistaking the attitude of William Jennings Bryan on the question of international peace. Our most pronounced pacifists have never expressed themselves more definitely than has our Secretary of State. Among the many addresses which he has delivered recently in which he has referred to international relations, we select these words from his oration delivered at the commencement exercises at the Holy Cross Academy, June 13, Cardinal Gibbons presiding. After granting that he found the inspiration for his address in a poem by one of the graduates, "A Song of Peace," he said:

Universal peace is the goal toward which we are heading. The Christian world is wearied of wars. It is wearied of international bickerings that do not always end in the shedding of men's blood, but too often engender bitter feelings that only the passing of years can take away. It was a mistake to believe that in doing away with wars we would become a race of weak and irresolute men. Men are beginning to understand the meaning of brotherhood as taught by the "Prince of Peace."

If one would know something of Mr. Bryan's power as a diplomat, let him read the Guthrie dinner address at Pittsburgh, of which the following is an abstract:

I am here for a double purpose: first, to introduce two distinguished gentlemen, His Excellency Viscount Chinda, who, with such ability and distinction, represents Japan at the capital of our nation, and Ambassador Guthrie, to whom has been given the honor of representing the United States at Tokyo. My connection with the department having to do with foreign relations makes it appropriate that I should be present on this occasion, when these representatives of their respective countries make each other's acquaintance.

The second purpose of my visit is to pay my respects to and express my personal regard for these gentlemen who are entrusted with the honorable mission of representing the two countries so long and intimately united in the bonds of friendship. I have had opportunity to